

## **EXHIBIT D**

**Velazquez, Virginia**

---

**From:** De La Paz, Monica  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 24, 2004 3:26 PM  
**To:** Velazquez, Virginia  
**Subject:** FW: INRP:095US - "Antihelminthic Drugs as a Treatment for Hyperproliferative Diseases" (Mukyopadhyay et al.)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** De La Paz, Monica  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 03, 2004 11:33 AM  
**To:** 'tmukhopa@hotmail.com'  
**Subject:** FW: INRP:095US - "Antihelminthic Drugs as a Treatment for Hyperproliferative Diseases" (Mukyopadhyay et al.)

Dr. Mukhopadhyay,

See below. Please review the attached draft declaration. If you have no changes, please print a copy and FAX to me as soon as possible. We would like to submit the executed declaration in a supplemental response to the US Patent and Trademark Office on Thursday, Nov. 4, 2004. If you have questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,  
Monica De La Paz

**Monica A. De La Paz, MD JD**

Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P.  
600 Congress Ave. Suite 2400  
Austin TX 78701-3271

Direct Dial: (512) 536-5639  
Telephone: (512) 474-5201  
Facsimile: (512) 536-4598

\*\*\*\*\*

This email message and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message and any attachments.

To reply to our email administrator directly, send an email to [postmaster@fulbright.com](mailto:postmaster@fulbright.com)

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

\*\*\*\*\*

-----Original Message-----

**From:** De La Paz, Monica  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 28, 2004 3:36 PM  
**To:** 's.chada@introgen.com'; 'aloni13@yahoo.com'; 'jroth@mdanderson.org'; 'tmukhopa@pu.ac.in'  
**Cc:** Parker, David; Highlander, Steven; Velazquez, Virginia; 'dparker@introgen.com'  
**Subject:** INRP:095US - "Antihelminthic Drugs as a Treatment for Hyperproliferative Diseases" (Mukyopadhyay et al.)

Dear Sunil, Dr. Mukhopadhyay, Dr. Mhashilkar, and Dr. Roth,

We have received an Office Action from the Patent and Trademark Office pertaining to the above-referenced

patent application. The Office Action alleges that the claims are not novel in view of Davis, an international patent application (WO00/41669). As part of the response to this rejection, we recommend submission of a declaration from you, the inventors, to show invention before the priority date of Davis. The priority date of Davis is Jan. 14, 2000. Sunil has kindly provided a draft manuscript of your research findings that was prepared before this date. We also recommend that as part of this declaration, you address certain assertions set forth by the examiner that were cited as a basis for the rejection of the claims. In particular, the examiner asserts that (1) it would be inherent for apoptosis to occur in a tumor following closure of or damage to a neovascular membrane serving the tumor; (2) expression of a tumor suppressor gene is an inherent feature of a tumor cell; and (3) multi-drug resistance is an inherent feature of a tumor cell.

The response to the Office Action was due today, Oct. 28, 2004. We have filed the response without the declaration, noting in the response that the declaration would be forthcoming. Therefore, we would like to submit an executed copy of the declaration to the Patent and Trademark Office in a supplemental response by no later than Thursday, Nov. 4, 2004.

Attached is a draft of the declaration that has already been reviewed and revised by Sunil. We now ask that all of you review the draft to make sure that it is factually and scientifically correct. Note that there are 8 Exhibits cited in the declaration. My secretary, Ms. Virginia Velasquez, will be sending you a pdf of each of these Exhibits later today or tomorrow morning.

If, after review of the Declaration, you find that it is in order and you can sign the Declaration in view of the certification in the last paragraph, please print out a copy, execute and date the Declaration, and fax it to me. Should you have minor corrections to the Declaration, you may make them in ink and sign and initial each correction in the margin. Should you have major corrections, you may contact me by fax, phone or email, and I will revise the Declaration and forward a further draft to you and the other inventors for execution.

Once again, please provide your comments by no later than Thursday, Nov. 4, 2004, if possible. If you have any further questions or comments about this letter, or about progress of the present application, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Monica

***Monica A. De La Paz, MD JD***

Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P.  
600 Congress Ave. Suite 2400  
Austin TX 78701-3271

Direct Dial: (512) 536-5639  
Telephone: (512) 474-5201  
Facsimile: (512) 536-4598

\*\*\*\*\*

This email message and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message and any attachments.

To reply to our email administrator directly, send an email to [postmaster@fulbright.com](mailto:postmaster@fulbright.com)

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PATENT**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Tapas Mukhopadhyay, *et al.*

Serial No.: 10/043,877

Filed: January 9, 2002

For: ANTIHELMINTHIC DRUGS AS A  
TREATMENT FOR  
HYPERPROLIFERATIVE DISEASES

Group Art Unit: 1642

Examiner: B. J. Fetterolf

Atty. Dkt. No.: INRP:095US

**DECLARATION OF TAPAS MUKHOPADHYAY, SUNIL CHADA, ABNER  
MHASHILKAR, AND JACK A. ROTH UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.131**

We, Tapas Mukhopadhyay, Sunil Chada, Abner Mhashilkar, and Jack A. Roth, hereby declare as follows:

1. We are the joint inventors of the subject matter claimed in the above-referenced patent application, U.S.S.N. 10/043,887, filed January 9, 2002.
2. We are submitting this declaration to set forth facts demonstrating that the invention as reflected in the claims of the above-referenced patent application was reduced to practice prior to January 14, 2000, the PCT filing date of Davis (WO00/41669).
3. Attached as Exhibit 1 is Davis (WO00/41669).
4. Submitted as Exhibit 2 to this declaration is a copy of a draft manuscript of our experiments and results, entitled "Potent Induction of Apoptosis by Anthelmintics in Human Lung Cancer Cells: Involvement of Wild-Type p53 and p21 Kinase Inhibitor," which was prepared prior to January 14, 2000.

5. Reduction to practice is shown by a description of our experiments and results in our draft manuscript (Exhibit 2). This manuscript details our studies pertaining to the effect of benzimidazoles, including fenbendazole and mebendazole, on the regulation of apoptosis in human lung cancer cells. See Exhibit 2, summary, page 2. We studied the *in vitro* effect of fenbendazole and mebendazole on human lung cancer cell lines, and found that these drugs dramatically inhibited the growth of lung cancer cells in culture. See Exhibit 2, pages 2 and 9-10, FIG. 1. Both febendazole and mebendazole showed an apoptotic effect on H460 cancer cells. Exhibit 2, page 9-10, FIG. 1. Western blot analysis using specific antibodies against Bcl-2, Bcl-xL, Bax, RB, cdc2, Cdk2, Cyclin A, Cyclin D and p53 demonstrated that benzimidazole treatment resulted in a dose and time dependent nuclear accumulation of wild-type p53, and no alteration in levels of any of the other proteins. Exhibit 2, pages 2, 9-10, FIG. 2, FIG. 3. The kinetics of nuclear accumulation correlated with the induction of apoptotic cell death. Exhibit 2, pages 2 and 10, FIGS. 4-6.

6. The effect of benzimidazole was further assessed on a number of human cell lines. We found that only the cell lines containing the wild-type p53 were highly sensitive to growth inhibition and apoptosis after benzimidazole treatment. Exhibit 2, pages 2 and 11-13, FIGS. 7-8, Table I, and Table II. In contrast, cell lines carrying mutated p53 were less sensitive to the cytotoxic effect of the benzimidazoles. Exhibit 2, pages 2 and 11-13, FIGS. 7-8, Table I, and Table II. Restoration of wild-type p53 function made tumor cells more sensitive to benzimidazole-induced apoptosis. Exhibit 2, page 2 and 12-13, FIG. 8. Our findings indicated that benzimidazoles selectively induce apoptosis in human NSCLC cells, strongly suggesting that a p53 dependent mechanism contributes to the cytotoxicity of benzimidazoles in human cancer cells.

7. All work disclosed in the invention disclosure form was conducted in the United States of America.

8. Therefore, the invention as reflected in the claims of the above-referenced patent application was reduced to practice prior to January 14, 2000.

9. Furthermore, we have reviewed WO00/41669 (Davis, Exhibit 1) and the Office Action dated June 28, 2004. Davis fails to disclose the invention set forth in the referenced patent application because it fails to demonstrate a cytotoxic effect of benzimidazoles against cells of a hyperproliferative lesion, such as a tumor. Rather, Davis purports to disclose use of certain 5(6)-substituted benzimidazole-2-carbamates as agents that can damage blood vessels. However, no data demonstrating damage to vasculature is provided. Instead, Davis performed an experiment (page 13, line 1 through page 14, line 4) in CaNT tumor-bearing mice wherein the mice were injected with various compounds intraperitoneally, and then were injected with a fluorescent dye 6 or 24 hr later. One minute later, the animals were killed and tumors evaluated under UV illumination. Blood vessels were identified by fluorescent outlines and vascular volume was said to be quantified using the method of Chalkley, 1943 (J. Natl. Cancer Inst., 4:47-53, 1943; Exhibit 3). However, the “quantitative morphologic tissue analysis” set forth in Chalkley was not contemplated for use in measuring vascular volume. Rather, Chalkley describes a method for evaluating ratios of nucleocytoplasmic volumes or comparing volume ratios of active versus inactive glands. Therefore, it is clear that the methods disclosed in Chalkley are not a validated surrogate assay for vascular volume, and as such, the data presented in Davis is difficult to accurately interpret.

10. Davis fails to provide evidence to indicate that the observed effect on vascular volume has any tumor-selectivity, as only tumor vasculature was evaluated. Furthermore, there

is no indication that the presumed reduction in tumor vascular volume observed in Davis (Exhibit 1, page 13, line 1 through page 14, line 4) represents vascular damage as a result of administration of a benzimidazole. Data are presented as a percent reduction compared to control. However, no information pertaining to the control is provided. It is well known that tumors possess “leaky” vasculature, and thus the reduction in UV staining is not expected, as it would be predicted that the lack of patent blood vessels in tumors would produce enhanced leakage of fluorescent dye in tumors, which may be exacerbated by benzimidazoles.

11. Although Davis claims “use of vascular damaging agents,” no evidence of vascular damage is presented. Furthermore, no cytopathic effect against tumor cells was shown in Davis. A neovascular membrane that supplies blood to a tumor contains cells, such as endothelial cells, that are distinct from tumor cells served by the neovascular membrane. In particular, the cells of the neovascular membrane are not cancer cells.

12. We have previously demonstrated that Mebendazole does not kill human primary endothelial cells in culture (Mukhopadhyay *et al.*, Clin. Cancer Res. 8:2963-9, 2002; Exhibit 4). Thus, the cytotoxic effect of Mebendazole *in vivo* is directed against tumor cells and not endothelium. We have demonstrated that MZ blocks production of VEGF from tumor cells (data not shown) which can enhance anti-tumor effects – this is likely the mechanism underlying the anti-angiogenic effect, and is mediated via tumor cell activity and not directly against endothelium .

13. There exists more than one mechanism of cell death. Apoptosis is but one example. Another major mechanism of cell death is necrosis. A third mechanism is anoikis. These mechanisms of cell death are defined by morphological features of the cell. When a neovascular membrane associated with a tumor is damaged or occluded, it does not necessarily

follow that tumor cell death due to apoptosis will result. For instance, tumor cell death may be by necrosis due to lack of nutrients and oxygen.

14. Furthermore, recent clinical studies have failed to demonstrate significant patient benefit with anti-angiogenic agents, such as thalidomide and endostatin. Davis *et al.*, (Clin. Cancer Res. 10:33-42, 2004; Exhibit 5) recently showed that endostatin can elicit anti-angiogenic effects in human tumors, however the reduced vascularization did not correlate with induction of apoptosis in tumor cells and did not result in tumor growth reduction. Similar lack of efficacy of endostatin was found in an independent study (Thomas *et al.*, J Clin Oncol. 21:223-31, 2003; Exhibit 6), and was also observed in trials with thalidomide (Thomas *et al.*, Br J Haematol. 123:436-41, 2003; Exhibit 7).

15. Expression of a tumor suppressor gene by a cell is not known to be a requirement for a cell to be a tumor cell. Some tumor cells express a tumor suppressor gene, whereas others do not. Furthermore, many tumor cells express a mutant tumor suppressor gene. It is a widely held belief that the function of tumor suppressor genes is to protect against development of cancer: thus expression of tumor suppressor genes in cancerous cells generally results in activation of cell cycle arrest mechanisms and ultimately, cell death. This concept has been exhaustively validated using the p53 tumor suppressor, however additional studies have shown the concept to be a truism. For example, it has been shown that genetic transfer of p53, Rb, E2F-1, PTEN, p16, mda-7, APC, and fus-1 results in tumor cell death. In contrast, expression of oncogenes (which promote cell proliferation and provide cell survival signals) is a requirement for tumor cell growth. Examples of such oncogenes, which act in opposition to tumor suppressors, are PI3K, bcl-2, beta-catenin, surviving, and c-myc.

16. Regarding drug resistance, not all tumor cells are multi-drug resistant. Multi-drug resistance is an acquired trait and generally requires selection with cytotoxic drugs to render a tumor cell multi-drug resistant. Tumor cells *per se* are responsive to cytotoxic drugs. However, due to their inherent property of mutability, drug-sensitive cells are killed and drug-resistant clones are selected. Furthermore, considerable polymorphism exists in expression and function of P-glycoprotein, the MDR1 gene product (see Ieiri *et al.*, Clin Pharmacokinet.43:553-76, 2004; Exhibit 8). The MDR1 (ABCB1) gene polymorphism and its clinical implications. This natural variation in MDR1 can strongly affect therapy of many diseases.

17. We hereby declare that all statements made by our own knowledge are true and all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true and further that statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment under § 100 of Title 18 of the United States Code, and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of this application or any patent issued thereon.

<hr/> Date	Tapas Mukhopadhyay
<hr/> Date	Sunil Chada
<hr/> Date	Abner Mhashilkar
<hr/> Date	Jack A. Roth